

AQA Response

16 to 19 level 1 English and maths qualifications consultation

May 2026

Executive summary

AQA is an independent education charity, providing high quality assessments that are fair, reliable and support students. Today, we're the largest provider of academic qualifications taught in schools and colleges. We set and mark exam papers for over half of all GCSEs and A-levels taken every year. But exams are only part of the story – we also make sure the content of our qualifications support great teaching. Our qualifications are designed to suit a range of abilities and include GCSEs, AS and A-levels, the Extended Project Qualification and Technical Awards. Our qualifications are internationally recognised and taught in more than 40 countries around the world and they're highly valued by employers and universities.

AQA welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Department for Education's consultation on new Level 1 English and maths qualifications for 16 to 19 year-olds. Drawing on our 120 years of assessment expertise, we support the government's aim to provide a meaningful stepping-stone qualification for students with prior attainment at grade 2 or below, for whom the current GCSE resit policy is not delivering good outcomes. Evidence shows that GCSE resit pass rates are strongly correlated with prior attainment, with very low success rates for students entering from grade 2 or below, and particularly poor outcomes for vulnerable learners including disadvantaged students and those with SEND. We therefore agree in principle that a new Level 1 qualification could better support foundational learning and progression.

Our response emphasises the need for qualifications that:

- align clearly with GCSE content and assessment objectives to maintain a coherent progression route;
- integrate foundational KS2/KS3 knowledge in an age-appropriate way;
- avoid becoming an alternative end-point rather than preparation for GCSE;
- complement, rather than duplicate, Functional Skills Qualifications; and
- adopt a modular approach in maths and a linear approach in English, reflecting differences in subject structure and learning progression.

We also highlight the importance of clarity on eligibility, the relationship with FSQs, and the need for careful design to ensure the qualification is engaging and accessible for lower-attaining and vocational learners. Overall, we believe these proposals have the potential to improve outcomes if they are designed with a clear progression purpose, strong construct validity, and a focus on high-quality teaching and learning.

Cohort

Question 7: Who among the 16-19 students under Condition of Funding with a grade 2 or below prior attainment do you think would benefit most from this qualification? Why?

The current English and maths resit policy isn't working for the majority of students who are entered. We know that the only around 25 per cent of students achieve a grade 4 or higher in English, and only 15 per cent in maths. Meanwhile, the pass rates for other Level 2 qualifications is around 88 per cent in English and 64 per cent in maths; and higher still for Level 1 qualifications at 96 and 88 per cent.

The low pass rate for GCSE qualifications is likely driven by the fact that around half of entries are students who achieved lower than a grade 3 when they initially sat their GCSEs. In 2023, around 85 per cent of students who achieved lower than a grade 3 in English and 81 per cent of students who achieved lower than a grade 3 in maths were then entered into a GCSE resit.

This matters because the pass rates for GCSE resits are strongly correlated with prior attainment. 48 per cent of students who achieved a grade 3 in English and 44 per cent of students who achieved a grade 3 in maths at the end of Key Stage 4 went on to achieve a grade 4 in their GCSE resits by age 19. For students who achieved a grade 2 at the end of Key Stage 4, these figures drop considerably to 21 and 13 per cent in English and maths respectively. For those who achieved a grade 1, only 6 and 5 per cent respectively achieve a grade 4.

We also know that students from vulnerable backgrounds are less likely to pass their GCSE resits by age 19. This group includes disadvantaged students, and those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.

Given that we see poor outcomes for these students, and that they represent some of the most vulnerable in society we agree, in principle, that the government is right to introduce a Level 1 qualification. We agree with the overarching objective of supporting some students to build their foundational knowledge before then potentially resitting their English and maths GCSEs.

Question 8: What opportunities do the proposed qualifications present for 16-19 students?

As we describe above, a new Level 1 qualification that is designed specifically for this group of lower-attaining students is likely to be better suited to their knowledge and skills on entry.

Question 9: Considering the diverse prior attainment and progress levels within this cohort, what challenges do you anticipate for those students who we envisage would typically complete the qualification within one year before moving to GCSE?

Given the low prior attainment of this group, as well as their vulnerabilities, getting them engaged with core academic subjects is likely to be challenging.

It is also likely that a considerable proportion of these students will be taking the new qualification alongside a vocational programme. Having a more traditional classroom-based course could be particularly challenging for vocational students, who may have intentionally gone down a vocational route precisely because they did not feel able to engage or thrive in a more academic environment. This means that the government needs to give serious thought to how this qualification is taught and the

extent to which it can be engaging and inclusive for students who have not previously been able to achieve Level 2 in English and maths.

It also isn't clear from the consultation *how* these new qualifications will sit alongside Functional Skills Qualifications and the factors which will determine whether a student is put on a Level 1 qualification or an FSQ. Our view is that the new Level 1 qualification will need to be designed so that it complements FSQs and gives providers meaningful choice when deciding which pathway is most suitable for individual students.

Another uncertainty here is whether the Level 1 qualification is suitable for students who are unlikely to progress beyond Level 1 or whether those students should be encouraged to do an FSQ instead. Students who have not achieved a grade 3 at GCSE are likely to be heterogeneous and many may be vulnerable. Those who achieved a high grade 2 might be quite different to those who did not get a grade at all, perhaps because they missed significant time at school. For the latter group, it might be too optimistic to get them to a grade 3 equivalent in a year or so, in which case an alternative pathway such as an FSQ may be a more suitable option.

The government will need to provide further guidance and clarification on the relationship between these two qualifications.

Finally, the government should consider whether it is appropriate to distinguish between English and maths when designing the approach and eligibility of the new Level 1 qualifications.

Modularity

Question 10: Do you think these qualifications should adopt a modular structure, or would a linear structure better support achievement and progression? What risks and opportunities do you see with these options, and why?

[Select: Modular]

It is important to note that the stated purpose of these qualifications is a formative one, namely “to consolidate the foundational skills and knowledge needed to prepare lower prior attaining students (grade 2 or below) before they then enrol directly onto a GCSE” (p. 3 of the consultation document). A formative aim (for learners to acquire and consolidate foundational skills and knowledge relating specifically to the domains of GCSE mathematics and English language) is, arguably, better served by formative assessment interventions, than by requiring students to take another qualification. This is the rationale behind AQA's GCSE mathematics-related [Stride](#) assessment, for instance, which explicitly focuses on GCSE mathematics curriculum content that is foundational in the sense that without having mastered it, learners are unlikely to be able to acquire the knowledge, skills, and understanding required to obtain a grade 4 or better on the GCSE.

If the intended learning outcomes are to be delivered by means of a qualification, then the qualification design needs to maximise positive washback effects on learning. A modular assessment design could play a part in that for the mathematics qualification, but it is less clear that would be feasible or effective for the English qualification. It is important not to confuse the purpose of the new qualification; the intention appears to be a summative assessment which helps students determine their readiness for a GCSE resit. It would be supported during teaching with formative assessment. Modular assessments do

provide feedback but should not be a substitute for formative assessment approaches that can help determine a student's readiness. Receiving poor results in modular assessments entered before a student is ready could have a disproportionate negative effect on motivation.

GCSE mathematics (in its current specification: of course content may change in response to curriculum and assessment reform) has three broad assessment objectives, which learners are expected to demonstrate in the context of subject content specified in a very detailed and granular way. There are clear hierarchies of topics (based on logical dependencies, for example simplifying algebraic expressions requires prior understanding of order of operations and arithmetic), and this is reflected in the tiered structure of the examination, with the foundation tier covering a subset of the knowledge and skills required on the higher tier. Thus, the subject lends itself quite naturally to being learned in bite-sized chunks, with learners developing mastery of topic areas, and building confidence before progressing to the next topic.

By contrast the GCSE English examination tests candidates' proficiency with respect to six assessment objectives (and a further three objectives are certified by means of the speaking and listening endorsements). It has no specified subject content in the way that mathematics does. The examination is not tiered, and differentiation between candidates is achieved less by using easier or harder questions, but rather by appraising the quality of candidates' responses to relatively open-ended prompts. Learners acquire proficiency not so much by mastering one topic and then progressing to the next, as by a more holistic process of continuous improvement. This kind of learning is less obviously amenable to modular certification.

Indeed, Ofsted 1999 research showed modular assessment was less suited to English, where the assessment can interrupt the teaching of themes, which run across multiple modules. Similarly, Carmen L.Vidal Rodeiro and Rita Náda 2010 found modular routes in English led to lower grade outcomes than via a linear route.

On the other hand, adopting a linear approach means students have to wait longer for a formal summative assessment and it can be challenging to maintain engagement, especially with a lower achieving group of students for that period of time.

On balance our recommendation therefore would be to explore the adoption of a modular approach to the mathematics qualification, and a linear approach to English.

Of course that would not stop teachers formally testing students in English, for example around the same time as mathematics modules were being sat: but such assessments would not be suitable for aggregation to generate a final certification, because it is less likely that students would be able to demonstrate the intended standard for "part" of the construct before they had completed their course of study.

There is a risk that structural modality could be incorrectly seen as a proxy for progress: evidence from the Oxford/Ofqual review of modular and linear GCSEs shows that structural divergence from GCSE frameworks does not in itself improve outcomes and can increase the risk that learners are channelled into pathways that do not translate into GCSE success. For a qualification intended as a stepping stone, such divergence risks undermining its core purpose.

Question 11: What challenges do you anticipate there would be in delivering modular qualifications for the identified cohort of students? If such challenges arise, what strategies or mitigations would you recommend to address them?

There is the risk that students focus on the module they are being tested on and then forget it, once it has been sat and awarded: in other words that they do not acquire a sufficiently rooted proficiency in the necessary skills to obtain a grade 4 or higher on the GCSE.

From a practical perspective, the module assessments need to be accommodated within the year of study. Assuming a small number (2-3) of modules, the options are to have fixed points at which modules can be taken; to have fixed intervals (testing windows) within which modules can be taken; or to offer module assessments on demand, when teachers feel students are ready to sit them.

All of these options allow module assessments to be taken digitally (onscreen), although the on-demand option is likely to limit the style of assessment to using questions that can be auto-marked (e.g. solely multiple-choice or single-mark, factual response items), as it is infeasible to have markers available on demand. Offering fixed module series or modules in fixed windows would allow styles of assessment that could be either human-marked or auto-marked.

The best technical approach to aggregating results across modules (accommodating re-sits of modules if they are permitted) would have to be developed in conjunction with the grading scale determined for the qualifications. For example, a version of the uniform mark scale approach to placing module marks onto a common scale, based on the grade boundary marks set for each module, that was used when A-levels and GCSEs were awarded in a modular fashion, could be employed. If modules are offered strictly on-demand, however, that would likely require a different approach to module grading and aggregation, for example using an item-response psychometric model with pre-calibrated items drawn from a pre-tested item bank.

There can sometimes be pressures to enter before students are ready, and the net result of this is a cycle of resits which is demotivating. However, if testing is available on demand this could reduce the initial pressure to enter students early. Testing on demand can also present logistical challenges, particularly for centres with limited access to resources. So, while this should be available for centres, it should not be a requirement.

The more frequent formal testing associated with a modular structure can increase stress for some students (Oxford research), but it could be more motivating for the lower achieving students or those who do not yet have the confidence to move to GCSE.

If you identified any challenges, what strategies or mitigations would you recommend to address them? Please explain your answer below:

Guidance to teachers on when to enter students for formal assessments. If assessments are on-demand, piloting of tests to check whether the intended GCSE-style competencies could be validly assessed using a more restricted range of item types.

Question 12: Are there particular groups of students who might be particularly advantaged or disadvantaged by either a modular or linear approach?

[Select Yes]

A linear approach could challenge students who have problems engaging and staying motivated and interested.

Modular exams are often preferred in alternative settings because they address specific challenges faced by vulnerable learners:

- **Reduced Anxiety:** Breaking qualifications into smaller "units" helps manage the mental load and "exam series" pressure.
- **Flexibility:** Students can sit exams when they are ready rather than being tied to a single terminal assessment date.
- **Immediate Feedback:** Results from early modules can be used to inform further teaching and boost student confidence.
- **Improved Retention:** Spreading the assessment load allows for a more personalized learning pace.

Heinrich and Stringer 2009 found schools with lower-ability pupils reported that there was a positive impact to modularisation of the curriculum. These included greater motivation and engagement following success in earlier modules, and the spreading of workload into more bite-sized chunks, for students who tended to underperform in terminal exams.

However, research undertaken by Oxford University did not support claims that modular or linear exams tend to favour male or female students, or affect the outcomes of low and high socio-economic status students differently.”

[Modular versus linear GCSEs: does the structure of exams matter? - OUCEA](#)

Most of the research in this area has been carried out in the context of high-stakes, higher-level, academic assessments, so may not generalise well to the intended target group for these qualifications

Content

Question 13: Should the subject content be organised to reflect a similar structure to the future GCSE subject content requirements as set out in the GCSE subject content and assessment objectives (current versions can be seen here) for a) English language and b) Mathematics, with the addition of additional foundational content as necessary? If not, is there an alternative way of organising content that would be more suitable? Please explain the reasoning for your suggested approach. This is to inform only; decisions on content and organisation will not be taken until explicitly consulted on by DfE and Ofqual respectively

[Yes, with specific English and maths points below.]

The subject content for the proposed Level 1 English and maths qualifications should be organised to reflect the same high-level structure, domains and assessment objectives as the future GCSE English Language and maths requirements.

This is essential if the qualification is to function as a stepping stone to GCSE resit, rather than becoming an alternative end point in its own right. In determining and organising the content, care must be taken to ensure this new qualification's purpose is distinctive from Functional Skills and other entry level or Level 1 type qualifications.

For English:

- 1. We recommend alignment with GCSE subject content requirements and assessment objectives because this is essential for progression, equity and clarity of purpose.**

For English this would require organising Level 1 content around the same underlying constructs as the revised GCSE English Language e.g., reading comprehension, language analysis, evaluation, and written communication. This provides a clear progression route and credible currency for learners, providers and employers. This approach enables the explicit inclusion of foundational KS2 and KS3 content where learners have gaps, taught through curriculum choices which can include age-appropriate and context-relevant texts suitable for post-16 resit learners in English studying vocational courses.

From our experience of delivering qualifications at this level³, we know that explicitly structuring the qualification around recognisable English Language constructs and GCSE assessment objectives provides continuity for learners progressing towards GCSE, rather than positioning itself as a parallel literacy pathway such as Functional Skills.

- 2. We recommend full-breadth coverage to reduce the risk of construct under-representation**

Evidence from research into post-16 GCSE resit provision, including EEF-commissioned reviews⁴, indicates that approaches focusing on selective or partial coverage of English content can allow learners to appear successful in the short term while leaving them under-prepared for the full demands of GCSE English Language.

Organising content to reflect the full breadth of GCSE subject content, rather than sampling isolated topics or skills, reduces the risk of construct under-representation and supports cumulative learning across reading, writing and language knowledge. This is particularly important if these qualifications are not to become a de facto alternative to GCSE for lower-attaining learners.

- 3. We recommend that foundational KS2 and KS3 English content should be integrated rather than separated**

Many learners in this cohort have experienced disrupted or inequitable access to literacy learning across KS2 and KS3, often shaped by wider social, cultural and educational factors. As a result, there may be uneven development in foundational knowledge such as sentence construction, vocabulary, reading fluency and comprehension. Evidence from EEF⁵, Myhill et al⁶ and wider academic research in writing development and cognitive science indicates that foundational literacy knowledge (including grammar, vocabulary and sentence control) is most effectively secured when taught explicitly within GCSE-aligned reading and writing contexts, rather than through separate or lower-status preparatory "pre-GCSE" units.

The content structure for English should therefore:

- retain GCSE-level text types and purposes, including texts and contexts adapted in an age-appropriate way and aligned to post-16 vocational study where appropriate
- explicitly include foundational language knowledge (e.g. syntax, vocabulary, sentence control) within the prescribed content
- ensure that KS2/KS3 foundational elements are positioned as integrated into progress towards GCSE, not as a reset or step backwards to an earlier curriculum phase

There are also many strong existing curriculum models for this from KS2 and 3 providers.

4. **We recommend considering the connection between content and modularity**

How content is specified and sequenced will influence whether modular approaches support or undermine learning.

Organising content primarily around discrete skills or preparatory topics would risk:

- fragmenting English into artificial components
- lowering expectations for disadvantaged learners
- encouraging the qualification to function as an end point rather than preparation for GCSE

Specifying content first which is aligned to GCSE subject content and assessment objectives and sequenced appropriately helps ensure that:

- progression expectations remain clear
- content does not fragment into isolated competencies
- any subsequent decisions about structure do not weaken the stepping-stone purpose of the qualification

5. **We recommend content is organised to enable flexibility in qualification design**

The content should allow qualification and assessment design to enable accessibility in terms of topics/contexts covered in texts and the language used in texts. Texts must be meaningful for the diverse groups of students who will be using this new qualification. The content should be organised to enable effective engagement which can be supported, for example, by multimedia resources which scaffold learning and develop knowledge and skills.

For Maths:

Aligning a Level 1 stepped maths qualification to the emerging GCSE Mathematics subject content structure is sensible, but it shouldn't be a straight copy. It will work best as a parallel, progression-focused framework with explicit foundational layers built in.

1. **We recommend alignment with GCSE subject content requirements and mathematical practices because this is essential for progression, equity and clarity of purpose.**

If the Level 1 structure mirrors GCSE maths domains (Number, Algebra, Ratio & Proportion, Geometry & Measures, Statistics/Probability), learners will see a direct path towards achieving the GCSE. In addition,

clear alignment would support a smoother transition to GCSE if objectives are mirrored, i.e., reasoning and problem solving. Schools already plan around GCSE strands, so alignment reduces cognitive and planning load.

- 2. We recommend the inclusion of foundational knowledge to ensure that students are given the opportunity to secure the key elements of mathematics before progression to GCSE-style content.**

This would include building explicit sub-domains that sit ‘under’ the GCSE maths content; teachers in this sector describe how many students fail to grasp these underpinning concepts which block progress into the main GCSE subject content. The subdomains would include,

- Core number (place value, operations and estimation)
- Mathematical communication (terminology, word problems)
- Pre-algebra (patterns, simple contexts, input/output functions)

Question 14: What should these qualifications include to help teachers teach effectively and support good learning e.g. a specific approach to structure? Please tell us why you think your suggested approach would work well.

Response – see detailed points below which are specific to English and maths

For English:

To support effective teaching and strong learning outcomes, these qualifications should combine nationally prescribed content with clear guidance on structure, sequencing and intent. This is particularly important in post-16 resit contexts, where teaching time is limited, staff may not always be English specialists, there is diversity of learners’ starting points and learner confidence and motivation is often low.

- 1. Clear expectations about curriculum coherence and progression**

The qualification should make clear that content is intended to be taught:

- coherently and cumulatively across the programme
- with regular revisiting of key reading, writing and language knowledge
- in ways that reinforce links between different aspects of English Language

Research from cognitive science⁷ shows that learners make more durable progress when knowledge is revisited and connected. This is especially important for learners with fragmented prior learning. Existing AQA provision at entry level demonstrates how signalling coherence and progression supports consistent delivery without over-prescription.

- 2. Explicit identification of foundational knowledge within the content**

The qualification should clearly identify:

- key foundational elements drawn from KS2 and KS3 where learners commonly have gaps (e.g. sentence structure, grammar, vocabulary, reading fluency)
- expectations that these elements are taught explicitly and revisited

EEF evidence and cognitive science research⁸ show that learners do not acquire foundational knowledge incidentally. Making this explicit in content expectations supports teacher confidence and consistency across providers. There is strong KS2-3 expertise in the system already which can be applied to FE curriculum planning. The new National Curriculum aims to re-sequence the teaching of grammar through the key stages; this work will also support planning for stepping stone and re-sit learners.

3. Clear alignment to GCSE assessment objectives and task types

The qualification should:

- map content directly to GCSE English Language assessment objectives
- use recognisable GCSE-style task types (e.g. extended reading responses, evaluation, sustained creative / persuasive writing)
- avoid functional or purely procedural formats

This maintains construct validity and ensures that success in the Level 1 qualification meaningfully prepares learners for GCSE resit. This ensures that the qualification provides a genuine alternative to Functional Skills.

4. Clear expectations around spoken language

Given that many learners will already have achieved the spoken language endorsement, formal assessment of this element should not be required, but spoken language should be recognised as an important pedagogical tool supporting reading and writing, with exploratory and presentational talk valued throughout. This could be reflected by including the post-16 phase in the oracy framework. In this way, unnecessary repetition and timetable pressures can be avoided, while recognising the strong evidence that structured talk supports literacy development.

For maths:

1. We recommend the qualification should be organised into a small number of connected strands to avoid fragmented learning such that they are:

- Sequenced cumulatively (each key topic builds on the last, see Q13)
- Revisited regularly (spiral curriculum)
- Explicitly connected to promote cross-domain understanding.
- Applies maths in real-life contexts, including related to wider studies where appropriate

2. We recommend the qualification should address and integrate mathematical practices:

- Common misconceptions
- Links between topics (not components of isolated topics)
- Reasoning (“why does this work?”)
- Interpretation (“what does this mean?”)
- Checking (“is this sensible?”)

3. We believe this approach would work well for maths for the following reasons.

Organising content into a small number of connected strands supports curriculum coherence. Students are more likely to understand how ideas link (e.g. ratio, graphs, and algebra). This is particularly important for resit learners, who often struggle not because of individual topics, but because they lack a joined-up understanding.

Second, the focus on core mathematical ideas (reasoning, interpretation and checking) targets the concepts that underpin success at Level 2 and in real life. Teaching the content in depth using these ideas, prioritises transferable understanding over superficial coverage, which is more effective for long-term progress.

Finally, the model promotes maths engagement. Relevant contexts and manageable progression help rebuild confidence and motivation.

Summary

Our recommendation is that these qualifications will best support effective teaching and good learning if they:

- are structured around GCSE-aligned content and constructs
- maintain a clear stepping-stone purpose, not an alternative endpoint
- explicitly integrate foundational KS2/KS3 knowledge in an age-appropriate way
- provide clarity for teachers without over-prescription
- avoid structural assessment features being mistaken for progress in themselves

This approach is well supported by existing research and by lessons from AQA's current entry-level stepping stone qualifications and offers the best chance of improving outcomes for learners who have not yet achieved a GCSE grade 4+.

Grading

Question 15: The Review recommended that the qualifications should be graded to the equivalent of 'a strong GCSE grade 3.' Do you agree that the qualifications should recognise a level of attainment that is equivalent to the level of attainment that students with a grade 3 in GCSE have?

If students have previously obtained a grade 2 or lower at GCSE, then a grade equivalent to a GCSE grade 3 will represent progress in their learning and ensure they are well placed to progress further and ultimately achieve a grade 4 at GCSE.

If the standard was set lower than this then it is possible that students will not have demonstrated meaningful progress during the course of this study and may not be ready to progress to achieve a grade 4 in their GCSE.

The consultation does not define what it means by a "strong" GCSE grade 3. The process for defining the standard will need to be considered further and we welcome the opportunity to work with Ofqual on this.

Question 16: Do you think that achievement below the level broadly comparable to that typical of students achieving a grade 3 at GCSE should also be recognised in the grades awarded for these qualifications?

[Select Yes]

An argument could be made for making this a Pass/Fail and focussing solely on achieving a level equivalent to grade 3 at GCSE.

It would be clear and gives a single threshold value for students to aim for and can be used to engage students in learning and develop interests without concerns around grading.

Pass/fail is typically compatible with almost all forms of assessment, but is often associated with mastery or competency-based approaches and it can be used in conjunction with features from other grading systems as well as a range of approaches to learning and certification.

However, there are good reasons for avoiding a Pass/Fail structure:

- Fail is a harsh word with emotive connotations, which can impact mindset and decision making
- Doesn't give students feedback or show their progress since last taking the assessment
- Some falsely view pass/fail qualifications as easier and there are misconceptions around why some students fail

Ultimately a more fine-grained grading scale (e.g. Pass/Merit/Distinction) would allow students to demonstrate progress even if they have not quite reached the level equivalent to a strong grade 3. This is important to keep students motivated. Such a structure could allow for a clear definition of equivalence to a strong grade 3 (i.e. Distinction).

Question 17: What are the key design considerations to ensure these qualifications have value for students who pass the level 1 qualifications but may not then progress on to gain a GCSE grade 4?

The value of these qualifications for those students who pass them, but do not progress to gain a GCSE grade 4, rests in end users having confidence in them as a meaningful and useful measure of attainment. There is an inevitable tension between these qualifications serving to provide a stepping stone to success at GCSE on the one hand, and being endpoints in their own right, on the other. A non-pass/fail grading structure, as advocated above, would go some way towards addressing the latter requirement.

Question 18: Are there other key steps we could take to ensure that the qualifications are recognised and valued by employers, parents and other external audiences as a separate qualification to the GCSE? What might they be?

[Select Yes]

If these qualifications are to be recognised and valued, their position in the broader qualification landscape must be clear and enable employers to understand what students gaining these qualifications can do, know and can understand.

Employers are more likely to value these qualifications if they have a role in the design of the learning outcomes they are designed to attest to. An extensive and properly funded communication campaign will be needed to support the launch, to explain the benefits to end users including FE, HE, employers and parents.

Question 19: Do you think that as well as the overall qualification result being reported a student's attainment in any individual modules or components should also be reported on? What do you think are the benefits and risks of this approach?

[Select Yes]

Yes, an overall certificate should be provided for passing the qualification, together with individual grades and mastery statements for each module. Students need to have something to show to potential employers or their next education provider that they have secured mastery in specific areas especially if they have not achieved the desired outcome in, or completed, the overall certificate.